

REMARKS

The Examiner's continued attention to the present application is noted with appreciation. The amendments to the claims are offered to better clarify the amendments made in the last response. No new matter has been introduced into the claims, but rather, again, the amendments help to clarify what Applicant was describing as his invention in the prior claims. Likewise, this response is to clarify the prior responses.

The Examiner rejected claims 26, 32, 34, 38, 41, 43, 44, 47, 51, 54, and 59-61 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sutphen. The Examiner also rejects claims 29-31, 35-37, 39, 40, 42, 45, 46, 48-50, 52, 53, 55-57, 63, 66-87, and 89 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sutphen, either alone or in view of Taylor, Howard, or Siew. Such rejections are respectfully traversed, particularly as to the claims as amended. The present claims clearly recite illumination of substantially the entire length of the support. The Examiner construes the support of Sutphen to be only the top section, and not the entire flagpole. The present claims have been amended to clarify that the banner is shorter than the entire support. Note that on page 26, lines 22-23 of the specification, "support" is defined as a pole, flagpole, beam, wand, arm, stick, and the like, and not a section or portion thereof. Therefore, as recited in the claims as amended, Sutphen discloses only illumination of the upper part of the support, near the flag. The vast majority of Sutphen's support (the flagpole) comprises opaque tubular metal sections 9, which are impossible to illuminate from a light source disposed within the support. Thus all of the present claim limitations are not taught or suggested by the prior art cited, as is required by MPEP 2143.03.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all grounds of rejection and objection have been avoided and/or traversed. It is believed that the case is now in condition for allowance and same is respectfully requested.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner believes that prosecution of this application might be expedited by discussion of the issues, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned agent for Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Also being filed herewith is a Petition for Extension of Time to July 9, 2007, which is the first business day after July 7, 2007; credit card authorization has been given for payment of the appropriate fee. Authorization is given to charge payment of any additional fees required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Acct. 13-4213.

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Philip D. Askenazy, Reg. No. 56,721
Direct line: (505) 998-6132

PEACOCK MYERS, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)
P.O. Bcx 26927
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-6927

Telephone: (505) 998-1500
Facsimile: (505) 243-2542

Customer No. 005179

G:\A-CLIENTS\Odyssey\AMDS\Odyssey Lighting\OAR 7-9-06.doc